1 2 3 4 5 6 7	KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321) United States Attorney MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549) Chief, Criminal Division SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013) Assistant United States Attorney 150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900 San Jose, California 95113 Telephone: (408) 535-5056 FAX: (408) 535-5066 Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov Attorneys for Plaintiff	*E-filed 9/28/06*
9	UNITED S	TATES DISTRICT COURT
10	NORTHERN I	DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 12	SAN	N JOSE DIVISION
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. 06-00634 RS
14	Plaintiff,))
15	V.	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
16	JOSE ALEJANDRO MARTINO-	
17	GONZALES,)) SAN JOSE VENUE
18	Defendant.)
19		
20	On September 21, 2006, the parties in	n this case appeared before the Court for an arraignment.
21	After the defendant was arraigned and en	tered a plea of not guilty, Assistant United States
22	Attorney Susan Knight then explained that	at the government recently provided discovery to the
23	defendant's attorney, Alfredo Morales, ar	nd requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial
24	•	per 2, 2006. The defendant, through his attorney, agreed
25		s agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is
26	appropriate based on the defendant's need	d for effective preparation of counsel.
27	//	
28	//	
	Stipulation and [proposed] order No. 06-00634 RS	1

Case 5:06-cr-00634-RS Document 10 Filed 09/28/06 Page 2 of 2

1 2	SO STIPULATED: KEVIN V. RYAN United States Attorney
3	DATED: /s/ SUSAN KNIGHT
4	Assistant United States Attorney
5	DATED: /s/
6	ALFREDO M. MORALES Counsel for Mr. Martino-Gonzales
7	Counsel for ivii. iviatumo-Gonzales
8	
9	Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded
10	under the Speedy Trial Act from September 21, 2006 until November 2, 2006. The Court finds,
11	based on the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested
12	continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The
13	failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary
14	for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a
15	miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made
16	under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).
17	SO ORDERED.
18	
19	DATED: 9/28/06
20	Ulated States Magistrate Judge
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

Stipulation and [proposed] order No. 06-00634 RS $\,$